

**REMARKS**

Claims 1 and 33-92 are all the claims pending in the application, of which claims 65 to 90 are withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

**Claim 1, 33-44, 49, 52, 54-56, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey (WO 99/03112) in view of Schwob (US 5,152,011), Yoshio et al. (JP 4310631, hereinafter “Yoshio”), and Browne et al. (WO 92/22983, hereinafter “Browne”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

    a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;

    an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and

    a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

**1. “speech synthesizer”**

As shown above, claim 1 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 1.1 on pages 2 to 6 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined,

must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

2. “switch”

As shown above, claim 1 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 1.1 on pages 2 to 6 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP §§ 2142-43).

3. “processor”

Independent claim 1 also recites, *inter alia* (emphasis added):

a processor, coupled to the tuner and the memory by signal lines, that processes the received broadcast signal to obtain the data, stores the data as a database in the memory or updates the database according to the data, provides a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus, selects data from the database in response to the accepted selections, and provides the selected data in digital form.

At page 3 of the Office Action, the rejection is based on the assertion that De Bey describes a receiver (40) having a processor (52) that is configured to provide a user interface for selecting data from a database stored in memory (42, 46) of the receiver (40) by use of a keypad (54), as shown below (emphasis added):

in digital form and converts the selected data from digital form to an analog signal, provides a user interface for interacting with the database, see Fig. 2 (keypad 54, TV 44 provides user input to select program stored in memories 42, 46);

the processor is configured to provide the user interface for selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selections and providing the selected data in a digital form, see Fig. 2 (52) and page 9, lines 10-11, page 19, lines 32-33;

the processor is configured to provide the user interface for selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selections and providing the selected data in a digital form, see Fig. 2 (52) and page 9, lines 10-11, page 19, lines 32-33;

However, the controller (52) in De Bey does not provide any user interface for selecting data from a database stored in memory of the receiver (40). Rather, the keypad (54) is merely for enabling a subscriber to initiate a request for content from the cable television network (36), as shown below (*see* De Bey, p. 11, ll. 18-27) (emphasis added):

Some CATV systems can accommodate bidirectional decoders or receivers, and for this type of system the receiver  
20 40 is provided with a key pad 54 to enable the subscriber to  
initiate a request via the CATV network 36. However, the  
majority of CATV systems are unidirectional (simplex) and a  
subscriber request must therefore be made over the public,  
switched telephone network (PSTN) 56. The subscriber request  
25 via the PSTN 56 may be verbal or via touch tone keying similar  
to that provided by other on-line subscriber network service  
providers.

As shown above, the subscriber of De Bey may initiate a request to the cable television network (36) for data stored in storage devices (28) (*see* De Bey, FIG. 2, p. 9, ll. 30-36, “head end means for providing a video program... storage devices 28”) of the cable television network (36). There is no teaching or suggestion that the processor (52) provides “a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus” that are stored at the receiver, as similarly recited in claim 1.

At page 4 of the Office Action, the rejection is also based on the assertions that De Bey provides a user interface to access programs stored in a database, and Yoshio provides a set of menus for describing the database, as shown below (emphasis added):

While De Bey teaches that the user interface provides an access to the program stored in the database, the combination of De Bey and Schwob does not explicitly teach that the user interface provides *a set of menus describing the database, and accepts selections from the set of menus.*

Yoshio et al ('631) (Yoshio) discloses:

a tuner for receiving a broadcast signal,

a memory coupled to the tuner for storing data in the received broadcast signal in a database,

a user interface for providing a set of *menus describing the database, and for accepting selections from the set of menus, see page 25, [0009] line 5; [0010] line 6; page 27, [0013] line 13;*

As previously discussed, De Bey does not, in fact, describe a user interface for providing access to programs stored in a database of the receiver. Yoshio also fails to teach or suggest providing "a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus," as recited in claim 1.

Instead, paragraphs 5 and 10 of Yoshio (*see* Yoshio, 2<sup>nd</sup> Translation, attachment to Appeal Brief filed on October 15, 2008) only describe a portable playback device, separate from the receiver in Yoshio, for selecting items stored on removable storage media, as shown below (emphasis added):

(Means for Solving the Problem)

The above described disadvantages can be solved by employing an information transmission system employing a rewritable optical disk characterized in that, in an information transmission system between an information provider that provides audio information and a plurality of information recipients, the information provider classifies audio information on an item by item basis, the audio information is transmitted to the information recipients in a form compressed at a time shorter than required for audio playback, the information recipients receive the thus transmitted audio information by means of a receiver, the audio information is temporarily recorded in a rewritable optical disk by means of an optical disk recording device, and only items selected from among items of audio information are replayed at a desired time by employing an optical disk playback device.

(0010)

The thus transmitted audio information is played back as audio information by using an optical disk playback device. A magneto-optical disk playback device exclusively used for playback can be made more compact, so it can be made into a portable device, thus making it possible to perform playback in a train, or listen to audio information replayed while driving with it being mounted on a vehicle. The playback device has a function of allowing selection of required items from level-based menus, making it possible to pick up only information that a recipient is interested in and replaying it. The playback device also allows attachment of an image

As shown above, Yoshio makes clear that the system includes (1) a receiver and (2) a portable playback device, separate from the receiver, and only the playback device includes a set of menus. There is no teaching or suggestion that the receiver in Yoshio includes any "a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus" that are stored at the receiver, as similarly recited in claim 1.

Therefore, even if the receiver (40) of De Bey could have somehow been modified based on the receiver of Yoshio, the modified receiver would still fail to teach or suggest the "processor" and "user interface," as recited in claim 1.

At page 3 of the Office Action, Schwob is cited merely for teaching an audio amplifier. At page 5 of the Office Action, Browne is cited merely for teaching updating a database. Each

of Schwob and Browne is not cited for, and does not cure, the deficient disclosures of De Bey and Yoshio discussed above. As a result, even if De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne could have somehow been combined, the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne would still fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne for at least these reasons.

**Claim 58**

Independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, “storing the data in a database in memory... providing a set of menus describing the database...accepting selections from the set of menus...selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selection,” which are features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1. At page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner commonly rejects claims 1 and 58. Accordingly, claim 58 is patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

**Claims 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Official Notice.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Official Notice is taken for teaching the features of claims 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57. However, the Official Notice does not cure the deficient disclosures of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claims 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 are patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Official Notice.

**Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Wysong (U.S. Patent 3,922,607).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 62 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Wysong is cited merely for teaching a continuous reception of a broadcast program, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 62 is patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Wysong.

**Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Wysong, and further in view of “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks.”** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 63 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks” is cited merely for teaching a date stamp to indicate data currency, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 63 is patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, Wysong, and “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks.”

**Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Myers et al. (U.S. Patent 5,272,752, hereinafter “Myers”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 64 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Myers is cited merely for teaching a receiver that disables itself upon command from a tuner, and fails to cure

the deficient disclosures of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 64 is patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, Wysong, and Myers.

**Claims 91 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Bey in view of Schwob and Yoshio, and further in view of Wysong (US 3,922,607).**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 91 recites, *inter alia*:

a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;

an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and

a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

1. “speech synthesizer”

As shown above, claim 91 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 1.6 on pages 18 to 22 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.



2. “switch”

As shown above, claim 91 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 1.6 on pages 18 to 22 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP §§ 2142-43).

3. “processor”

Independent claim 91 also recites, *inter alia* (emphasis added):

a processor, coupled to the tuner and the memory by signal lines, that processes the received broadcast signal to obtain the data, stores the data as a database in the memory or updates the database according to the data, provides a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus, selects data from the database in response to the accepted selections, and provides the selected data in digital form.

At page 19 of the Office Action, the rejection is based on the assertion that De Bey describes a receiver (40) having a processor (52) that is configured to provide a user interface for selecting data from a database stored in memory (42, 46) of the receiver (40) by use of a keypad (54), as shown below (emphasis added):

**in digital form and converts the selected data from digital form to an analog signal, provides a user interface for interacting with the database, see Fig. 2 (keypad 54, TV 44 provides user input to select program stored in memories 42, 46):**

**the processor is configured to provide the user interface for selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selections and providing the selected data in a digital form, see Fig. 2 (52) and page 9, lines 10-11, page 19, lines 32-33;**

**the processor is configured to provide the user interface for selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selections and providing the selected data in a digital form, see Fig. 2 (52) and page 9, lines 10-11, page 19, lines 32-33;**

However, the controller (52) in De Bey does not provide any user interface for selecting data from a database stored in memory of the receiver (40). Rather, the keypad (54) is merely for enabling a subscriber to initiate a request for content from the cable television network (36), as shown below (*see* De Bey, p. 11, ll. 18-27) (emphasis added):

Some CATV systems can accommodate bidirectional decoders or receivers, and for this type of system the receiver  
20 40 is provided with a key pad 54 to enable the subscriber to  
initiate a request via the CATV network 36. However, the  
majority of CATV systems are unidirectional (simplex) and a  
subscriber request must therefore be made over the public,  
switched telephone network (PSTN) 56. The subscriber request  
25 via the PSTN 56 may be verbal or via touch tone keying similar  
to that provided by other on-line subscriber network service  
providers.

As shown above, the subscriber of De Bey may initiate a request to the cable television network (36) for data stored in storage devices (28) (*see* De Bey, FIG. 2, p. 9, ll. 30-36, “head end means for providing a video program...storage devices 28”) of the cable television network (36). There is no teaching or suggestion that the processor (52) provides “a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus” that are stored at the receiver, as similarly recited in claim 91.

At page 20 of the Office Action, the rejection is also based on the assertions that De Bey provides a user interface to access programs stored in a database, and Yoshio provides a set of menus for describing the database, as shown below (emphasis added):

While De Bey teaches that the user interface provides an access to the program stored in the database, the combination of De Bey and Schwob does not explicitly teach that the user interface provides a set of menus describing the database, and accepts selections from the set of menus.

Yoshio et al ('631) (Yoshio) discloses:

a tuner for receiving a broadcast signal,

a memory coupled to the tuner for storing data in the received broadcast signal in a database,

a user interface for providing a set of menus describing the database, and for accepting selections from the set of menus, see page 25, [0009] line 5; [0010] line 6; page 27, [0013] line 13;

As previously discussed, De Bey does not, in fact, describe a user interface for providing access to programs stored in a database of the receiver. Yoshio also fails to teach or suggest providing "a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus," as recited in claim 91.

Instead, paragraphs 5 and 10 of Yoshio (*see* Yoshio, 2<sup>nd</sup> Translation, attachment to Appeal Brief filed on October 15, 2008) only describes a portable playback device, separate from the receiver in Yoshio, for selecting items stored on removable storage media, as shown below (emphasis added):

[Means for Solving the Problem]

The above described disadvantages can be solved by employing an information transmission system employing a rewritable optical disk characterized in that, in an information transmission system between an information provider that provides audio information and a plurality of information recipients, the information provider classifies audio information on an item by item basis, the audio information is transmitted to the information recipients in a form compressed at a time shorter than required for audio playback, the information recipients receive the thus transmitted audio information by means of a receiver, the audio information is temporarily recorded in a rewritable optical disk by means of an optical disk recording device, and only items selected from among items of audio information are replayed at a desired time by employing an optical disk playback device.

(0010)

The thus transmitted audio information is played back as audio information by using an optical disk playback device. A magneto-optical disk playback device exclusively used for playback can be made more compact, so it can be made into a portable device, thus making it possible to perform playback in a train, or listen to audio information ~~played~~ while driving with it being mounted on a vehicle. The playback device has a function of allowing selection of required items from level-based menus, making it possible to pick up only information ~~that a recipient is interested in and replaying it. The playback device also allows attachment of an image~~

As shown above, Yoshio makes clear that the system includes (1) a receiver and (2) a portable playback device, separate from the receiver, and only the playback device includes a set of menus. There is no teaching or suggestion that the receiver in Yoshio includes any "a user interface including a set of menus describing the database and for accepting selections from the set of menus" that are stored at the receiver, as similarly recited in claim 91.

Therefore, even if the receiver (40) of De Bey could have somehow been modified based on the receiver of Yoshio, the modified receiver would still fail to teach or suggest the "processor" and "user interface," as recited in claim 91.

At page 19 of the Office Action, Schwob is cited merely for teaching an audio amplifier. At page 21 of the Office Action, Wysong is cited merely for teaching continuous reception of a broadcast program. Each of Schwob and Wysong is not cited for, and does not cure, the deficient disclosures of De Bey and Yoshio discussed above. As a result, even if De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Wysong could have somehow been combined, the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Wysong would still fail to teach or suggest the combination of features recited in claim 91. Therefore, claim 91 and its dependent claim 92 are patentable over the combination of De Bey, Schwob, Yoshio, and Wysong for at least these reasons.

**Claims 1, 33-37, 49, 52, 54-56, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang (U.S. Patent 5,057,932) in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;  
an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and  
a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

**1. “speech synthesizer”**

As shown above, claim 1 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 2.1 on pages 22 to 26 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

**2. “switch”**

As shown above, claim 1 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 2.1 on pages 22 to 26 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Browne as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (see MPEP §§ 2142-43).

Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne for at least these reasons.

**Claim 58**

Independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, “storing the data in a database in memory... providing a set of menus describing the database...accepting selections from the set of menus...selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selection,” which are features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1. At page 22 of the Office Action, the Examiner commonly rejects claims 1 and 58. Accordingly, claim 58 is patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

**Claims 38, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Rovira (WO 92/10040).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 38, 41, and 42 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Rovira is cited merely for teaching conversion, compression, and encryption, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, and Yoshio discussed above regarding claim 1.

Therefore, claim 38, 41, and 42 are patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Rovira.

**Claims 39, 40, 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Official Notice.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 39, 40, 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Official Notice is taken for teaching the features of claims 39, 40, 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57. However, the Official Notice does not cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claims 39, 40, 45-48, 50, 51, 53, and 57 are patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Official Notice.

**Claims 43 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Rovira, and further in view of De Bey.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 43 and 44 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. De Bey is cited merely for teaching a decryption key. However, the De Bey does not cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Rovira discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claims 43 and 44 are patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, Rovira, and De Bey.

**Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Wysong.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 62 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Wysong is cited merely for teaching a continuous reception of a broadcast program, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 62 is patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Wysong.

**Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Wysong, and further in view of “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks.”** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 63 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks” is cited merely for teaching a date stamp to indicate data currency, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 63 is patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, Wysong, and “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks.”

**Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne, and further in view of Myers et al. (U.S. Patent 5,272,752, hereinafter “Myers”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 64 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Myers is cited merely for teaching a receiver that disables itself upon command from a tuner, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Browne discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 64 is patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, Wysong, and Myers.



**Claims 91 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lang in view of Schwob, Yoshio, Browne, and Wysong.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 91 recites, *inter alia*:

a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;

an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and

a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

1. “speech synthesizer”

As shown above, claim 91 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 2.8 on pages 42 to 45 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

2. “switch”

As shown above, claim 91 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 2.8 on pages 42 to 45 of the Office Action, the

rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP §§ 2142-43).

Therefore, claim 91 and its dependent claim 92 are patentable over the combination of Lang, Schwob, Yoshio, and Wysong for at least these reasons.

**Claims 1, 33-37, 45, 49, and 58-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**Claim 1**

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;

an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and

a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

**1. “speech synthesizer”**

As shown above, claim 1 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 3.1 on pages 45 to 47 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne or Schwob as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne or Schwob as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

2. “switch”

As shown above, claim 1 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 3.1 on pages 45 to 47 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne or Schwob as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne or Schwob as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP §§ 2142-43).

Therefore, claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the combination of Browne and Schwob for at least these reasons.

**Claim 58**

Independent claim 58 recites, *inter alia*, “storing the data in a database in memory... providing a set of menus describing the database...accepting selections from the set of menus...selecting data from the database in response to the accepted selection,” which are features similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1. At page 45 of the Office Action, the Examiner commonly rejects claims 1 and 58. Accordingly, claim 58 is patentable over the combination of Browne and Schwob for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above regarding claim 1.

**Claims 38, 41-44, 52-54, and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of De Bey.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 38, 41-44, 52-54, and 56 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. De Bey is cited merely for teaching compression, encryption, and decryption, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 38, 41-44, 52-54, and 56 are patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and De Bey.

**Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob and De Bey, and further in view of Official Notice.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 39 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Official Notice is taken for teaching the features of claim 39. However, the Official Notice does not cure the deficient disclosures of Browne, Schwob, and De Bey discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 39 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, De Bey, and Official Notice.

**Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Yoshio.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 40 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. At page 54 of the Office Action, the rejection is based on the assertion that page 26, lines 17 to 19, of Yoshio allegedly teaches converting alphanumeric data to voice by a speech synthesizer.

However, Yoshio fails to teach or suggest “the alphanumeric data is converted to voice data by the speech synthesizer” of the receiver in Yoshio. Rather, Yoshio only describes “a

**broadcaster** that provides audio information...a fixed format such as weather forecast or stock market information is inputted by utilizing mechanical voice synthesizing” (see Yoshio, 2<sup>nd</sup> Translation, ¶ 12). There is no teaching or suggestion that the receiver in Yoshio includes any synthesizer, and much less “the alphanumeric data is converted to voice data by the speech synthesizer,” as recited in claim 40.

Therefore, Yoshio does not cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob. Therefore, claim 40 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Yoshio.

**Claims 46 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Guenther et al. (U.S. Patent 5,086,510, hereinafter “Guenther”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 46 and 50 depend on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Guenther is cited merely for teaching a mounted input device, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claims 46 and 50 are patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Guenther.

**Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Benbassat et al. (U.S. Patent 4,700,322, hereinafter “Benbassat”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 47 depends on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Benbassat is cited merely for teaching a speech interface, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 47 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Benbassat.

**Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Whitby et al. (GB 2 258 102, hereinafter “Whitby”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 48 depends on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Whitby is cited merely for teaching a tuner for skipping channels, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 48 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Whitby.

**Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Date (“An introduction to Database Systems”).** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 51 depends on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Date is cited merely for teaching a hierarchical database, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 51 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Date.

**Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob and De Bey, and further in view of Yoshio.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 55 depends on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Yoshio is cited merely for teaching a magnetic-optical disk, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne, Schwob, and De Bey discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 55 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, De Bey, and Yoshio.

**Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Official Notice.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 57 depends on claim 1 and incorporate all the features of claim 1. Official Notice is cited merely for teaching efficient data transmission, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 57 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Official Notice.

**Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Wysong.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 62 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Wysong is cited merely for teaching a continuous reception of a broadcast program, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 62 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Wysong.

**Claim 63 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob and Wysong, and further in view of “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks”<sup>1</sup>.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 63 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks” is cited merely for teaching a date stamp to indicate data currency, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne, Schwob, and Wysong discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 63 is patentable over the

---

<sup>1</sup> At page 59 of the Office Action, the rejection heading appears to include a typographical error that indicates claim 63 is rejected over “Ryan.”

combination of Browne, Schwob, Wysong, and “Method for Multimedia Non-repudiation in Computer Networks.”

**Claim 64 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Myers.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 64 depends on claim 1 and incorporates all the features of claim 1. Myers is cited merely for teaching a receiver that disables itself upon command from a tuner, and fails to cure the deficient disclosures of Browne and Schwob discussed above regarding claim 1. Therefore, claim 64 is patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Myers.

**Claims 91 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Browne in view of Schwob, and further in view of Wysong.** Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent claim 91 recites, *inter alia*:

a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data;

an audio amplifier that amplifies an audio data and outputs the amplified audio data to a loudspeaker, if the data is the audio data; and

a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.

1. “speech synthesizer”

As shown above, claim 91 recites, “a speech synthesizer that converts an alphanumeric data to voice data, if the data is the alphanumeric data.” At section 3.14 on pages 61 to 63 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne, Schwob, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer.”

The Office bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP § 2142, “The examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness”). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness



under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office must show that the prior art reference(s), when combined, must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations (*see* MPEP § 2143). Accordingly, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne, Schwob, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “speech synthesizer,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness.

2. “switch”

As shown above, claim 91 also recites “a switch that provides the data to the speech synthesizer or the audio amplifier.” At section 3.14 on pages 61 to 63 of the Office Action, the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne, Schwob, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch.”

Again, because the rejection does not identify any portions of Browne, Schwob, or Wysong as allegedly teaching the “switch,” Applicant respectfully submits the rejection necessarily fails to establish a *prima facie* conclusion of obviousness (*see* MPEP §§ 2142-43).

Therefore, claim 91 and its dependent claim 92 are patentable over the combination of Browne, Schwob, and Wysong for at least these reasons.

**Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Christopher J. Bezak /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: 202.293.7060  
Facsimile: 202.293.7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 25, 2012

---

Christopher J. Bezak  
Registration No. 63,241